

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 15, 16, 45, and 48-51 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, and 48-51 have been amended herein. This Response, submitted in reply to the Office Action dated February 2, 2009, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §

Claims 1-3, 15, 45, and 48-51

Claims 1-3, 15, 45, and 48-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Imai, U.S. Patent 5,930,037 in view of Takahashi et al., U.S. Patent 4,921,330 (henceforth Takahashi). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites:

An image display device, comprising:

a display panel which has a plurality of pixel sections each of which includes at least a pixel displaying an image for the first viewpoint and a pixel displaying an image for the second viewpoint, said pixel sections being provided periodically in one direction, and said display panel comprising an image surface on which the plurality of pixels are displayed

an optical unit refracts the light emitted from said pixels and emits the light in directions different from each other, and

an adhesive layer which is provided on a part of an area enclosing an image display area of said display panel to fix the optical unit and the display panel in line,

wherein the display panel and the optical unit are aligned so that light emitted from the at least one pixel displaying an image for the first view point is refracted and emitted by a specific region of the optical unit to arrive at said first view point, and

wherein the adhesive layer affixes the optical unit directly on the image surface of the display panel such that a positional relationship between the specific region of the optical unit and the at least one pixel displaying an image for the first view point of the display panel is maintained while permitting a difference in expansion or contraction between the optical unit and

the display panel so as to permit displacement of the optical unit due to expansion and contraction of a material of the optical unit.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Imai teaches substantially all of the claimed features, but acknowledges that Imai does not teach an adhesive layer being “provided on part of an area enclosing the image display area to fix the optical unit and the display panel in line”. The Examiner also acknowledges that Imai does not teach affixing the optical unit “such that a positional relationship … maintained while permitting a difference in expansion or contraction” as claimed. However, the Examiner asserts that Takahashi cures this deficiency. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has misconstrued the applied references.

As described in the specification, the optical unit and display panel must be carefully aligned. *See Pages 25-26*, for example, of the specification. This precise alignment is necessary so that light outgoing from the pixel for a right eye is incident on the viewer’s right eye, and light outgoing from the pixel for a left eye is incident on a left eye. *See Page 26, line 23-page 27, line 1*. As would be apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art, light must pass through specific areas of the optical unit if it is to arrive at its target destination as described.

Takahashi is directed to a composite projection screen made of a Fresnel lens plate 2 and a lenticular lens plate 3, and the composite projection screen is fixed to a cabinet. However, the Fresnel lens plate 2, which the Examiner analogizes to claimed display panel, is not actually a display panel having pixels and does not have an image surface. Thus, Takahashi cannot teach attaching an optical unit to a display panel as claimed.

Further, Takahashi merely teaches a single adhesive strip 7 holding the two plates together along a single, upper edge, so that any thermal expansion causes the plates to slide along each other. Thus, Takahashi does not actually teach maintaining a positional relationship between **a specific region of lenticular lens plate and a specific region of the Fresenel plate**

during thermal expansion because the plates are allowed to move relative to each other.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Takahashi does not teach “**the adhesive layer affixes the optical unit directly on the image surface of the display panel such that a positional relationship between the specific region of the optical unit and the at least one pixel displaying an image for the first view point of the display panel is maintained while permitting a difference in expansion or contraction between the optical unit and the display panel**” as claimed.

Further, the Examiner acknowledges that Imai does not teach these features either. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the applied references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or even suggest affixing “**the optical unit directly on the image surface of the display panel such that a positional relationship between the specific region of the optical unit and the at least one pixel displaying an image for the first view point of the display panel is maintained**” as claimed. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1, and all claims dependant thereon are patentable over the applied references for at least this reason.

Further, to the extent that claims 48-51 recite similar features, Applicant also submits that claims 48-51 are patentable for analogous reasons.

Further, claims 16 and 45 recite additional features, which further describe the orientation of the adhesive layer. Applicant respectfully submits the applied references also do not describe the specific features related to orientation of the adhesive layer. Specifically, the applied references do not teach “said adhesive layer is provided along a side orthogonal to the short side of said optical unit.” Further, the applied references actually teach away applying the adhesive layer to multiple edges to avoid undulation of the screen. *See* Takahashi, Col 2, line 61-Col. 3, line 8.

Claims 2-5, 15 and 16

Claims 2-3 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Imai in view of Takahashi as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Snaper (U.S. Patent 4,140,370). Further, claims 4, 5, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Imai in view of Takahashi as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Eichenlaub (U.S. Patent 5,410,345). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 2-5, 15, and 16 depend from claim 1, which has been shown above to be patentable over the applied references. Snaper and Eichenlaub do not cure the deficiencies of the other applied references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

For all the above discussed reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880 via EFS payment screen. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 4, 2009

/Michael C. Jones/
Michael C. Jones
Registration No. 63,266